arXiv:0706.0357v14 [math.GM] 28 Jul 2010

An integral formula for $1/|\zeta(s)|$ and a proof of the Riemann hypothesis

Hisanobu Shinya

July 29, 2010

Abstract

Let α and β be some bounded arithmetical functions and let $c(n;\alpha,\beta) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\alpha(k)\beta(n-k)$. Using Fourier analysis, we give two different ways for evaluating $F(x;\alpha,\beta) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty}\frac{c(n;\alpha,\beta)}{n^x}$. With those expressions, we further go on to prove $2\pi\Gamma(2x)\mathcal{R}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}|\zeta(x+iy)|^{-2}|\Gamma(x+iy)|^{-2}(1-\mathcal{K}(x+iy))dy$, where $\mathcal{R}(x)$ and $\mathcal{K}(x+iy)$ are some analytic functions of a complex variable x in the half-plane $\Re x > 1/2$. From this formula, we go on to consider, instead of the factor $1/\zeta(s)$, which has the Dirichlet series representation $1/\zeta(s) = \sum\frac{\mu(n)}{n^s}$ in the integral formula, another function $Y(s) := \sum\frac{\mu_{p_0}(n)}{n^s}$ where $\mu_{p_0}(n) = z\mu(n)$ if n is divisible by a prime p_0 and $\mu_{p_0}(n) = \mu(n)$ otherwise, and z is some real number. This function has the same singularities as $1/\zeta(s)$; indeed, it consists of $1/\zeta(s)$ and some factor which depends on the variables z and s. By introducing this function, we have an analogous integral formula; this time, the value of the factor of the integrand not including $1/\zeta(s)$ can be varied somewhat freely by changing z. This technique allows us to prove the Riemann hypothesis.

By a common sense that a man devotes what he believes is good to his loved one, I devote this paper to you, Izumi-chyan.

1 Introduction

The *Riemann zeta function*, customarily denoted by the Greek letter ζ, is defined by

$$\zeta(s) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^s}, \quad \Re s > 1.$$

As we can read in the 1859 paper of Bernard Riemann, one could reach the historical conjecture in the analytic theory of numbers, today widely known as the *Riemann hypothesis* on which this paper sets its objective, by applying the 19th-century complex function theory developed by Augustin Louis Cauchy to the ζ-function.

The precise statement of the conjecture to be tackled is as follows.
Conjecture 1. *Each nonreal zero of the Riemann zeta function has the real part equal to* 1/2.

The main result, which is a proof of Conjecture 1, I am planning to present in this paper may be rather regarded as one falling within the 19th-century analytic number theory. That is, I do not use functional analysis and the theory of automorphic forms, which, in my opinion, are presently popular topics of the theory. Prerequisites for reading this paper are some classic analytic number theory and introductory Fourier analysis found in [1] and [3], respectively.

Let us present an outline for how arguments proceed in the following sections, and how they lead to a proof of Conjecture 1.

First, in Sections 3 and 4, we prove the integral formula (Proposition C)

$$2\pi\Gamma(2x)\mathcal{R}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\zeta(x+iy)|^{-2}(1-\mathcal{K}(x+iy))|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy.$$

Here, $\mathcal{R}(x)$ is some function which is analytic in the half-plane $\Re x > 1/2$, and $\mathcal{K}(x+iy)$ is a finite-valued function in the half-plane $\Re x > 1/2$. One may regard this integral formula as an *evidence* (but not yet a proof) supporting Conjecture 1; we may infer from the the above-mentioned properties of $\mathcal{R}(x)$ that all the Riemann zeros are indeed located on the so-called critical line, for otherwise, the function $\mathcal{R}(x)$ should have a singularity at some point $x' > 1/2$. The reason the formula can not be a *proof* of the conjecture is that the factor $(1-\mathcal{K}(x+iy))$ may cancell out a singularity of $1/\zeta(x+it)$ at some point $x'+iy'$ with $x' > 1/2$ by $1-\mathcal{K}(x'+iy') = 0$, hence making the left side of the integral formula analytic in the half-plane $\Re x > 1/2$.

To overcome this difficulty, in Section 5, we consider another function

$$Y(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{p_0}(n)}{n^s}$$

where

$$\mu_{p_0}(n) = \begin{cases} z\mu(n) & : p_0|n \\ \mu(n) & : \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

as a factor in the integrand, instead of $1/\zeta(s)$; in a quite similar manner as we got the above integral formula, we get

$$2\pi\Gamma(2x)\mathcal{R}(x;z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |Y(x+it)|^2(1-\mathcal{K}(x+iy;z))|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy,$$

where $\mathcal{R}(x;z)$ is an analytic function of x in the half-plane $\Re x > 1/2$ for each fixed real number z; and $\mathcal{K}(x+iy;z)$ is some analytic function of x for each fixed y and z, bounded entirely in real numbers y for each fixed $\Re x > 1/2$, and $\mathcal{K}(x+iy;z) = o(1)$ as $|z| \to \infty$ for each fixed x and uniformly in all real numbers y. Now, making $\mathcal{K}(x+iy;z)$ as small as we please by making $|z|$ large, the integral function on the right would have a singularity at $x' > 1/2$ if the conjecture were false, while the left side would not, a contradiction which completes the proof of the Riemann hypothesis.

2 Notation

I employ the following notation throughout the paper.

$\mathcal{D}[\alpha]_x(y) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha(n)}{n^{x+iy}}$;

$c(n;\alpha,\beta) := \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \alpha(k)\beta(n-k)$;

$F_x(y;\alpha,\beta) := \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{c(n;\alpha,\beta)}{n^{x+iy}}$;

$\zeta(s) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}$;

$\Gamma_x(y) := \int_0^{\infty} e^{-t} t^{x+iy-1} dt$;

$(\mathcal{D}[\alpha]_x \Gamma_x)(y) := \mathcal{D}[\alpha]_x(y)\Gamma_x(y)$;

$\mathcal{F}[g](\xi) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(t) e^{-2\pi i t \xi} dt$;

$(f * g)(u) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(y) g(u-y) dy$.

3 Theorem A

Thence, we approach to Conjecture 1 via the following theorem.

Theorem A. *Let α and β be some bounded arithmetical functions. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} F_{2x}(0;\alpha,\beta) &= \frac{1}{2\pi\Gamma(2x)} (\mathcal{D}[\alpha]_x \Gamma_x * \mathcal{D}[\beta]_x \Gamma_x)(0) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{d|n} \frac{\alpha(d)\beta\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)}{(d+\frac{n}{d})^{2x}}, \quad x > 1. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem A is as follows.

Throughout the rest of the paper, we use the fact that $\Gamma_x(t)$ is a rapidly decreasing function of t for each fixed $x > 0$. That is, $\Gamma_x(t)$ as a function of t is a member of the so-called Schwartz space. The proof of this proposition is rather a cumbersome exercise, so we only give a sketch of the proof here.

The Gamma function, when written in a Fourier integral form, is given in (15) with $m = 1$. Now it is well-known that Fourier integral of a function belonging to the Schwartz space itself is a member of that space. Hence, we need only to show that the function $E_{x,1}(t)$ belongs to the Schwartz space, which is a straightforward routine.

This proposition allows us to use Fourier analysis in the way as performed in the discussion.

Firstly, we prove

$$F_{2x}(0;u,u) = \frac{1}{2\pi\Gamma(2x)} (\mathcal{D}[u]_x \Gamma_x * \mathcal{D}[u]_x \Gamma_x)(0), \quad x > 1 \tag{1}$$

where $u(n) := 1$ for all $n = 1, 2, \ldots$

If the series

$$u(1)e^{-t} + u(2)e^{-2t} + u(3)e^{-3t} + \cdots$$

are squared, we get

$$c(2; u, u)e^{-2t} + c(3; u, u)e^{-3t} + c(4; u, u)e^{-4t} + \cdots .$$

Now by definition we have

$$c(n; u, u) = n - 1,$$

and so

$$[u(1)e^{-t} + u(2)e^{-2t} + u(3)e^{-3t} + \cdots]^2 = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}(k-1)e^{-kt}.$$

On the relation

$$\Gamma(x)\frac{1}{n^x} = \int_0^{\infty} e^{-nt}t^{x-1}dt,$$

we multiply both sides by $c(n; u, u)$, sum over all $n = 2, 3, \ldots$, and get

$$\Gamma_x(y)F_x(y; u, u) = \int_0^{\infty} L(t; u)L(t; u)t^{x+iy-1}dt, \quad x > 2, \tag{2}$$

where

$$L(t; u) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u(n)e^{-nt}.$$

Here we note that the validty of interchanging integration and summation symbols which was performed for getting (2) can be shown without difficulty. In fact, pick $y = 0$. Then the integrand is a series of nonnegative terms. The rest of the details are left for the reader. (Use the fact [2, pp. 36] that *every series* $\sum k_n(x)$ *of summable functions for which* $\sum_n \int_a^b |k_n(x)|dx$ *converges, converges itself almost everywhere to a summable function, and the series can be integrated term by term* .)

Next, we consider the following relation

$$\Gamma_x(y)\mathcal{D}[u]_x(y) = \int_0^{\infty} L(t; u)t^{x+iy-1}dt, \tag{3}$$

which can be obtained in a similar manner as above. Expressing the integral on the right of (3) as a Fourier integral by making the change of variable $t = e^{2\pi v}$, we have

$$\Gamma_x\mathcal{D}[u]_x(y) = \mathcal{F}[H_x(t)](y), \tag{4}$$

where

$$H_x(t) := 2\pi L(e^{2\pi t}; u)e^{2\pi tx}$$

Now using the Fourier inversion formula to (4), we get

$$\mathcal{F}[\Gamma_x\mathcal{D}[u]_x(y)](-\xi) = H_x(\xi) \tag{5}$$

Taking the square of (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{F}[\Gamma_x\mathcal{D}[u]_x(y)](-\xi)\mathcal{F}[\Gamma_x\mathcal{D}[u]_x(y)](-\xi)\\&=[H_x(\xi)]^2=4\pi^2L(e^{2\pi\xi};u)L(e^{2\pi\xi};u)e^{4\pi\xi x}.\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

At this point, we recall a foundational result in Fourier anaylsis [3] that

$$\mathcal{F}[f*g](\xi)=\mathcal{F}[f](\xi)\mathcal{F}[g](\xi).$$

Using this equation in (6), we obtain

$$\mathcal{F}[(\Gamma_x\mathcal{D}[u]_x*\Gamma_x\mathcal{D}[u]_x)(y)](-\xi)=4\pi^2L(e^{2\pi\xi};u)L(e^{2\pi\xi};u)e^{4\pi\xi x}.\tag{7}$$

Taking the Fourier transform of (7), we get

$$(\Gamma_x\mathcal{D}[u]_x*\Gamma_x\mathcal{D}[u]_x)(z)=\mathcal{F}\left[4\pi^2L(e^{2\pi\xi};u)L(e^{2\pi\xi};u)e^{4\pi\xi x}\right](z).\tag{8}$$

But

$$\mathcal{F}\left[4\pi^2L(e^{2\pi\xi};u)L(e^{2\pi\xi};u)e^{4\pi\xi x}\right](z)=4\pi^2\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}L(e^{2\pi\xi};u)L(e^{2\pi\xi};u)e^{4\pi\xi x}e^{-2\pi i\xi z}d\xi,$$

and making the change of variable $r=e^{2\pi\xi}$, we get

$$\mathcal{F}[4\pi^2L(e^{2\pi\xi};u)L(e^{2\pi\xi};u)e^{4\pi\xi x}](z)=2\pi\int_0^{\infty}L(r;u)L(r;u)r^{2x-iz-1}dr.\tag{9}$$

Putting $z=0$ in (9), by (2), (8), and (9), the proof of (1) is completed.

Secondly, we note that a more general case in which we put $u\mapsto\alpha$ and $u\mapsto\beta$ in the above argument can be deduced from (1) and the boundedness of α and β easily. We omit the details.

In what follows, a similar reason can be used in going from the u,u case to a general α,β case. Hence we discuss by the general case.

Thirdly, we prove

$$F_{2x}(0;\alpha,\beta)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{d|n}\frac{\alpha(d)\beta\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)}{(d+\frac{n}{d})^{2x}},\quad x>1\tag{10}$$

We give two proofs of (10). The first is of elementary nature; it is plain that (10) would follow if we could show that for each given positive integer $n\geq1$, there is one and only one positive integer m which satisfies

$$n_1+n_2=n\quad\text{and}\quad\frac{m}{n_2}=n_1.$$

We omit the details for this as it is quite an easy exercise.

The second uses the so-called *multiplication formula*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\mathcal{F}[f](t)g(t)dt=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}f(t)\mathcal{F}[g](t)dt,\tag{11}$$

valid under a certain decaying condition of f and g on the real line.

By (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{2x}(0;\alpha,\beta) &= \frac{1}{2\pi\Gamma(2x)}(\mathcal{D}[\alpha]_x\Gamma_x * \mathcal{D}[\beta]_x\Gamma_x)(0) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi\Gamma(2x)}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\alpha(n)}{n^{x+iy}}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{\beta(m)}{m^{x-iy}}|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2dy. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Using the following well-known formula

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{a(n)}{n^s}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{b(n)}{n^s} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\sum_{d|n}a(d)b\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)}{n^s}, \tag{13}$$

valid under certain convergence conditions on the relevant series (for the precise statement of those conditions, see [1]), the series of the integrand is written as

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\alpha(n)}{n^{x+iy}}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{\beta(m)}{m^{x-iy}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\alpha(n)n^{-iy}}{n^x}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{\beta(m)m^{iy}}{m^x} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\sum_{d|n}\alpha(d)\beta\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)d^{-iy}\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)^{iy}}{n^x}.$$

Hence, the integral in (12) becomes, after interchanging the summation and integration symbols (that this operation is valid is clear by the proposition on $\Gamma_x(y)$ mentioned in the Introduction), the sum

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\alpha(n)}{n^{x+iy}}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{\beta(m)}{m^{x-iy}}|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2dy \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\sum_{d|n}\alpha(d)\beta\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)\left(\frac{n}{d^2}\right)^{iy}}{n^x}|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2dy \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\sum_{d|n}\alpha(d)\beta\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left(\frac{n}{d^2}\right)^{iy}|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2dy}{n^x} \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Now we analyze the following type of expression

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^{iy}|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2dy = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}n^{-iy}\Gamma(x+iy)m^{iy}\Gamma(x-iy)dy, \quad m,n\geq 1,$$

using (11) as follows. An integral defintion of the Γ-function is

$$\Gamma(x) := \int_0^{\infty}e^{-t}t^{x-1}dt, \quad x>0.$$

For each $x>0$, making the change of variable $t=mu$, we have

$$m^{-x}\Gamma(x) = \int_0^{\infty}e^{-mu}u^{x-1}du.$$

We put it in the form of the Fourier integral by the change of variable $u = e^{2\pi v}$; we get

$$\begin{aligned}
m^{-x}\Gamma(x) = \int_0^\infty e^{-mu}u^{x-1}du &= \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{-me^{2\pi v}}e^{2\pi vx-2\pi v}2\pi e^{2\pi v}dv \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^\infty 2\pi e^{-me^{2\pi v}}e^{2\pi vx}dv,
\end{aligned}$$

so that if we let $x \mapsto x - iy$, we may put

$$\begin{aligned}
m^{-x+iy}\Gamma(x-iy) &= e^{[\log m](-x+iy)}\Gamma(x-iy) \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^\infty 2\pi e^{-me^{2\pi v}}e^{2\pi vx}e^{-2\pi vyi}dv \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^\infty E_{x,m}(t)e^{-2\pi tyi}dt \\
&= \mathcal{F}[E_{x,m}(t)](y),
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where

$$E_{x,m}(t) := 2\pi e^{-me^{2\pi t}}e^{2\pi tx}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$n^{-x-iy}\Gamma(x+iy) = \mathcal{F}[E_{x,n}(t)](-y). \tag{16}$$

Now by (11), (15), and (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(mn)^{-x}\int_{-\infty}^\infty (m/n)^{iy}|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2dy &= \int_{-\infty}^\infty (mn)^{-x}(m/n)^{iy}\Gamma(x+iy)\Gamma(x-iy)dy \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^\infty \mathcal{F}[E_{x,n}(t)](-y)\mathcal{F}[E_{x,m}(t)](y)dy \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^\infty E_{x,n}(t)E_{x,m}(t)dt,
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where we used (11) in getting the last equality; choose $f \mapsto \mathcal{F}[E_{x,n}(t)](-y)$ and $\mathcal{F}[g](y) \mapsto \mathcal{F}[E_{x,m}(t)](y)$ in (11). The integral on the extreme right side is rewritten as, with the change of variable $u = e^{2\pi t}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\infty}^\infty E_{x,n}(t)E_{x,m}(t)dt &= \int_{-\infty}^\infty (2\pi)^2 e^{-(m+n)e^{2\pi t}}e^{4\pi tx}dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty 2\pi e^{-(m+n)u}u^{2x-1}du.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

But

$$\Gamma(2x) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t}t^{2x-1}dt, \quad (m+n)^{-2x}\Gamma(2x) = \int_0^\infty e^{-(m+n)t}t^{2x-1}dt,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} E_{x,n}(t)E_{x,m}(t)dt &= 2\pi \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-(m+n)u}u^{2x-1}du \\ &= (m+n)^{-2x}2\pi\Gamma(2x).\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Combining (17), (18), and (19) together, we finally get

Lemma B. *For any positive real numbers $m, n, x > 0$, we have*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^{iy} |\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy = \frac{(mn)^x}{(m+n)^{2x}} 2\pi\Gamma(2x).$$

The second proof of (10) is now completed by chooseing $m \mapsto n$ and $n \mapsto d^2$ in Lemma B, and substituting the result in (14).

We will refer to Lemma B in the next section where we discuss what could be done on Conjecture 1 with Theorem A.

4 Nontrivial zeros of the ζ-function and Theorem A

In this section, we shall prove
Proposition C. *For $x > 1$, we have*

$$2\pi\Gamma(2x)\mathcal{R}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\zeta(x+iy)|^{-2}(1-\mathcal{K}(x+iy))|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy,$$

where $\mathcal{R}(s)$ and $\mathcal{K}(s)$ are some finite-valued functions (precise expressions of these will appear shortly below) in the half-plane $Re(s) > 1/2$.

The proof of Proposition C is as follows.

Let $\mu(n)$ be the Mobius function defined by

$$\mu(n) := \begin{cases} (-1)^k & : n = p_{j_1}p_{j_2}\cdots p_{j_k} \\ 0 & : \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Choosing $\alpha = \beta = \mu$ in Theorem A, we have for $x > 1$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{d|n} \frac{\mu(d)\mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)}{\left(d+\frac{n}{d}\right)^{2x}} 2\pi\Gamma(2x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\zeta(x+iy)|^{-2}|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy. \tag{20}$$

Now it is easy to see that by the definition of μ, the series on the left of (20) is written as

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{d|n} \frac{\mu(d)\mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right)}{\left(d+\frac{n}{d}\right)^{2x}} = \sum_{n=LM^2, |\mu(L)|=|\mu(M)|=1, (L,M)=1} + \sum_{n=M, |\mu(M)|=1} = S_1 + S_2. \tag{21}$$

Firstly, using the multiplicativity of μ, we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{n=LM^2}\sum_{d|LM^2} \frac{\mu(d)\mu\left(\frac{LM^2}{d}\right)}{\left(d+\frac{LM^2}{d}\right)^{2x}} = \sum_{L,M^2} \frac{2\mu(L)|\mu(M)|}{(M+ML)^{2x}} \\ &= {}'\sum_{L} \frac{2\mu(L)}{(L+1)^{2x}} {}'\sum_{M^2} \frac{|\mu(M)|}{M^{2x}} =: \mathcal{R}(x), \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where the symbol "${}'\sum$" is a reminder for how the summation should be taken, which is stated as follows;

1. for each fixed $M^2 > 1$ with $|\mu(M)| = 1$, run through $L \geq 1$ with $|\mu(L)| = 1$ and $(M, L) = 1$;
2. $M^2 = 1 = L$.

These conditions are required not to sum up same terms on the right of (21).

Note that $\mathcal{R}(x)$ is bounded above by $2\zeta(2x)\sum_{n^2,|\mu(n)|=1} \frac{|\mu(n)|}{n^{2x}}$; for each fixed $M > 1$ with $|\mu(M)| = 1$, we have

$$\left| {}'\sum_{L} \frac{\mu(L)}{(L+1)^{2x}} \frac{|\mu(M)|}{M^{2x}} \right| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{2x}} \frac{|\mu(M)|}{M^{2x}}$$

and summing through all $M^2 > 1$ with $|\mu(M)| = 1$, we get the bound for $\mathcal{R}(x)$.

Secondly,

$$S_2 2\pi\Gamma(2x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(n) \sum_{d|n} \frac{1}{\left(d+\frac{n}{d}\right)^{2x}} 2\pi\Gamma(2x). \tag{23}$$

Choosing $m \mapsto d$, $n \mapsto \frac{n}{d}$ in Lemma B, we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^{2iy} n^{-x-iy} |\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy = \frac{1}{\left(d+\frac{n}{d}\right)^{2x}} 2\pi\Gamma(2x). \tag{24}$$

Substituting (24) in (23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 2\pi\Gamma(2x) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)\sum_{d|n} d^{2iy}}{n^{x+iy}} |\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W(x+iy)|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

For each fixed y, the function $h(n) := \sum_{d|n} d^{2iy}$ is multiplicative. Hence the product $\mu(n)h(n)$ is also a multiplicative function. At this point, we recall the following identity of Euler [1] that if f is a multiplicative function, then we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n^s} = \prod_{p} \left(1 + \frac{f(p)}{p^s} + \frac{f(p^2)}{p^{2s}} + \cdots\right). \tag{26}$$

With (26), it is readily seen that

$$W(x+iy) = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1+p^{2iy}}{p^{x+iy}}\right). \tag{27}$$

The Euler product representation of $W(x+iy)$ shows that $W \neq 0$ for $x > 1$. Hence, we could take the logarithm of both sides of (27) when $x > 1$, which is

$$\log W(x+iy) = \sum_p \log\left(1 - \frac{1+p^{2iy}}{p^{x+iy}}\right),$$

or with the well-known formula

$$\log(1-x) = -x - \frac{x^2}{2} - \frac{x^3}{3} + \cdots,$$

we may write

$$\log W(x+iy) = -\sum_p \frac{1}{p^{x+iy}} - \sum_p \frac{1}{p^{x-iy}} + E(x+iy), \tag{28}$$

where $E(x+iy)$ is some function satisfying

$$E(x+iy) = O\left(\sum_p \frac{1}{p^{2x-\epsilon}}\right).$$

for each $\epsilon > 0$. Exponentiating back the equation (28), we obtain

$$W(x+iy) = \exp\left(-\sum_p \frac{1}{p^{x+iy}}\right) \exp\left(-\sum_p \frac{1}{p^{x-iy}}\right) \exp(E(x+iy)). \tag{29}$$

Here we recall that

$$\zeta(x+iy)^{-1} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n^{x+iy}} = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{x+iy}}\right)$$

so that

$$\log(\zeta(x+iy)^{-1}) = -\sum_p \frac{1}{p^{x+iy}} + G(x+iy),$$

where

$$G(x+iy) = O\left(\sum_p \frac{1}{p^{2x-\epsilon}}\right).$$

Thus exponentiating back, we have

$$\zeta(x+iy)^{-1} = \exp\left(-\sum_p \frac{1}{p^{x+iy}}\right) \exp(G(x+iy)). \tag{30}$$

Substituting (30) in (29), we get

$$W(x+iy) = |\zeta(x+iy)|^{-2}\mathcal{K}(x+iy), \tag{31}$$

where

$$\mathcal{K}(x+iy) := \exp(E(x+iy) - G(x+iy) - G(x-iy)).$$

Inserting (31) in (25), we get

$$S_2 2\pi\Gamma(2x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\zeta(x+iy)|^{-2}\mathcal{K}(x+iy)|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy. \tag{32}$$

Finally, by (20), (21), (22), and (32), we have

$$2\pi\Gamma(2x)\mathcal{R}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\zeta(x+iy)|^{-2}(1-\mathcal{K}(x+iy))|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy,$$

which is the proposition.

Let us briefly discuss what can be inferred from Proposition C.

As a corollary to Proposition C we briefly show

Corollary 1. *If there exists only one nontrivial zero* $\rho_0 = x_0 + i\tau_0$ *of the Riemann* ζ*-function on the upper right half-plane* $x > 1/2$*, then the function* $\mathcal{K}(x+it)$*, as defined above, satisfies* $1 - \mathcal{K}(\rho_0) = 0$.

To prove the corollary, we recall the following:

(a) The function $\mathcal{R}(x)$ is regular for $x > 1/2$ and the meromorphic continuation of $[\zeta(s)]^{-1}$ to the half-plane $\Re(s) > 1/2$ is known to exist;

(b) it is known [4, pp.185] that

$$\log\zeta(x+it) = \sum_{|t-\gamma|\le 1} \log(s-\rho) + O(\log t) \quad \text{uniformly for } -1 \le x \le 2,$$

where γ denotes the imaginary parts of nontrival zeros ρ.

By the hypothesis of the corollary and (b), it is easy to show that there exists a constant A such that for each fixed $x > x_0 > 1/2$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\zeta(x+it)} = O(t^A). \tag{33}$$

If we regard x of the proposition as a complex variable, then since the integrand is seen as an analytic function of a complex variable x (note that if we change x to some another complex number then it only makes the absolute value sign of the integrand disappear; the integrand is written more generally as

$$\begin{aligned}&|\zeta(x+iy)|^{-2}(1-\mathcal{K}(x+iy))|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2\\ &= \frac{1}{\zeta(x+iy)\zeta(x-iy)}(1-\mathcal{K}(x+iy))\frac{1}{\Gamma(x+iy)\Gamma(x-iy)}),\end{aligned}$$

the integral can be seen as an analytic function of x and its analytic continuation beyond the line $x = 1$ is conceivable, provided that the integrand is integrable on the real line in the sense of Lebesgue integration theory.

Thence, by (a) and (33) we could extend the integral formula of the proposition to the half-plane $\Re x > x_0$.

Finally, as $x \to x_0^+$, the integral on the right of the formula in the proposition necessarily tends to ∞ in magnitude provided $1 - \mathcal{K}(\rho_0) \neq 0$, while the left member of the same formula tends to a finite value.

This completes the proof of the corollary.

5 A proof of the Riemann hypothesis

In this section, I give a sketch of what could be further done on the Riemann hypothesis with the integral formula of the proposition; we give a proof of Conjecture 1.

Instead of choosing $\alpha = \beta = \mu$ in Theorem A, consider choosing the following arithmetical function, for, say any real number $|z| \leq 1$ and a prime p_0,

$$\mu_{p_0}(n) = \begin{cases} z\mu(n) & : p_0 | n \\ \mu(n) & : \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The function μ_{p_0} is readily seen as multiplicative. Hence, with the Euler product representation, we could write

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{p_0}(n)}{n^s} = \prod_{p \neq p_0} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^s}\right)\left(1 - \frac{z}{p_0^s}\right) = \zeta(s)^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{p_0^s}\right)^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{z}{p_0^s}\right), \quad \Re s > 1.$$

With this expression, it is easy to show (some details are described below for the sake of completeness) that we have for $x > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\pi\Gamma(2x)\mathcal{R}(x;z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} & |\zeta(x+iy)|^{-2}|1 - \frac{1}{p_0^{x+iy}}|^{-2} \\ & \times |1 - \frac{z}{p_0^{x+iy}}|^2(1 - \mathcal{K}(x+iy;z))|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy, \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}(x;z) := {\prime\sum_{M^2}} \frac{[\mu_{p_0}(M)]^2}{M^{2x}} {\prime\sum_{L}} \frac{2\mu_{p_0}(L)}{(L+1)^{2x}},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}(x+iy;z) := & \left|1 - \frac{1}{p_0^{x+it}}\right|^2 \frac{1 - \frac{z(1+p_0^{2it})}{p_0^{x+it}}}{\left|1 - \frac{z}{p_0^{x+it}}\right|^2} \exp(E^*(x+iy) - G(x+iy) - G(x-iy)) \\ & \times \exp(\frac{1}{p_0^{x+iy}} + \frac{1}{p_0^{x-iy}}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$E^*(x+iy) := -\sum_{n\geq 2}\sum_{p\neq p_0} \frac{(1+p_0^{2iy})^n}{np^{n(x+iy)}}.$$

For completeness, we show here the detailed calculation for how the factor $K(x+iy;z)$ in (34) came out. If we put

$$Y(x+it) := \sum \frac{\mu_{p_0}(n)}{n^{x+it}}$$

then, the integrand is written as

$$\begin{aligned}&|\zeta(x+iy)|^{-2}|1-\frac{1}{p_0^{x+iy}}|^{-2}|1-\frac{z}{p_0^{x+iy}}|^2(1-\mathcal{K}(x+iy;z))|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2\\ &= |Y(x+iy)|^2(1-\mathcal{K}(x+iy;z))|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2\end{aligned}$$

At this point, if we recall how the equation in Proposition C was deduced, then the second integral term on the right of (34), which is

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |Y(x+it)|^2\mathcal{K}(x+it;z)|\Gamma(x+it)|^2 dt \tag{35}$$

should analogusly correspond to the second integral term on the right of the equation of Proposition C, which is

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\zeta(x+it)|^{-2}\mathcal{K}(x+it)|\Gamma(x+it)|^2 dt. \tag{36}$$

But recall that this equation in turn corresponds to the series

$$2\pi\Gamma(2x)\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mu(n)\sum_{d|n}\frac{1}{\left(d+\frac{n}{d}\right)^{2x}};$$

see (32). Hence the integral in question (35) should correspond to the series

$$2\pi\Gamma(2x)\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mu_{p_0}(n)\sum_{d|n}\frac{1}{\left(d+\frac{n}{d}\right)^{2x}}.$$

Now, using Lemma B, we have

$$2\pi\Gamma(2x)\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mu_{p_0}(n)\sum_{d|n}\frac{1}{\left(d+\frac{n}{d}\right)^{2x}} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\mu_{p_0}(n)\sum_{d|n}d^{2it}}{n^{x+it}}|\Gamma(x+it)|^2 dt.$$

Using the multiplicativity of the function $\mu_{p_0}(n)\sum_{d|n}d^{2it}$ and Euler-product representation, we have

$$V(x+it) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\mu_{p_0}(n)\sum_{d|n}d^{2it}}{n^{x+it}} = \prod_{p\neq p_0}\left(1-\frac{1+p^{2it}}{p^{x+it}}\right)\left(1-\frac{z(1+p_0^{2it})}{p_0^{x+it}}\right).$$

Taking the logarithm of both sides, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\log V(x+it) &= \sum_{p\neq p_0} \log\left(1-\frac{1+p^{2it}}{p^{x+it}}\right)+\log\left(1-\frac{z(1+p_0^{2it})}{p_0^{x+it}}\right)\\ &= -\sum_{p\neq p_0}\frac{1+p^{2it}}{p^{x+it}}-\sum_{n\geq 2}\sum_{p\neq p_0}\frac{(1+p^{2it})^n}{np^{n(x+it)}}+\log\left(1-\frac{z(1+p_0^{2it})}{p_0^{x+it}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Exponentiating back, we get, with (30),

$$\begin{aligned}V(x+it) &= \left(1-\frac{z(1+p_0^{2it})}{p_0^{x+it}}\right)\exp\left(-\sum_{p\neq p_0}\frac{1}{p^{x+it}}\right)\exp\left(-\sum_{p\neq p_0}\frac{1}{p^{x-it}}\right)\\ &\quad\times\exp\left(-\sum_{n\geq 2}\sum_{p\neq p_0}\frac{(1+p^{2it})^n}{np^{n(x+it)}}\right)\\ &= \left(1-\frac{z(1+p_0^{2it})}{p_0^{x+it}}\right)\exp\left(-\sum_{p}\frac{1}{p^{x+it}}\right)\exp\left(-\sum_{p}\frac{1}{p^{x-it}}\right)\exp\left(\frac{1}{p_0^{x+it}}\right)\exp\left(\frac{1}{p_0^{x-it}}\right)\\ &\quad\times\exp\left(-\sum_{n\geq 2}\sum_{p\neq p_0}\frac{(1+p^{2it})^n}{np^{n(x+it)}}\right)\\ &= \left(1-\frac{z(1+p_0^{2it})}{p_0^{x+it}}\right)\exp(E^*(x+it))|\zeta(x+it)|^{-2}\\ &\quad\times\exp(-G(x+it)-G(x-it))\exp\left(\frac{1}{p_0^{x+it}}\right)\exp\left(\frac{1}{p_0^{x-it}}\right)\\ &= \mathcal{K}(x+it;z)|Y(x+it)|^2\end{aligned}$$

as predicted.

By (34), we could, for instance, prove that the hypothesis of the corollary could not happen. (Hint: Vary z so that $1-\mathcal{K}(\rho_0;z)\neq 0$.)

Moreover, if we write

$$\mathcal{K}(x+it;z)=\frac{1-\frac{z(1+p_0^{2it})}{p_0^{x+it}}}{\left|1-\frac{z}{p_0^{x+it}}\right|^2}\mathcal{K}^*(x+it)$$

then the integral function

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\zeta(x+iy)|^{-2}|1-\frac{1}{p_0^{x+iy}}|^{-2} \\
&\qquad \times |1-\frac{z}{p_0^{x+iy}}|^2(1-\mathcal{K}(x+iy;z))|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy \\
=&\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\zeta(x+iy)|^{-2}|1-\frac{1}{p_0^{x+iy}}|^{-2} \\
&\qquad \times \left[|1-\frac{z}{p_0^{x+iy}}|^2-(1-\frac{z(1+p_0^{2iy})}{p_0^{x+iy}})\mathcal{K}^*(x+iy)\right]|\Gamma(x+iy)|^2 dy
\end{aligned}$$

of (34) is an analytic function of z in $|z| \le 1$, so that we could extend (34) to $|z| > 1$ by analytic continuation. Then for any sufficiently large $|z|$ (z real), the factor

$$1-\mathcal{K}^*(x+iy)(1-\frac{z(1+p_0^{2iy})}{p_0^{x+iy}})|1-\frac{z}{p_0^{x+iy}}|^{-2} = 1+o(1) \quad \text{as } |z| \to \infty$$

is nonzero, and so the whole integrand is made nonnegative by making z sufficiently large.

In this setting, the only task left for us towards the Riemann hypothesis is to find a way to analyze the situation in which there exist infinitely many zeros $\{\rho_{n_i}\}$ in the neighborhood of the vertical line $\Re(s) = 1$ and $\sup_i\{\Re(\rho_{n_i})\} = 1$ (or possibly for some other vertical line $\Re(s) = a$ with $a \in (1/2, 1)$). This problem may turn out to be not so hard.

Write the integral on the right side of (34) as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} = 2\int_0^{\infty} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2\int_{\tau_i-\epsilon_i}^{\tau_i+\eta_i},$$

where τ_i are the imaginary parts of the zeros, and numbers ϵ_i, η_i satisfy

$$[0,\infty) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty}[\tau_i-\epsilon_i, \tau_i+\eta_i].$$

Find a function $F(x)$ which has zeros of appropriate order at appropriate real points $\Re(\rho_{m_j})$ so that we could take the following limit

$$\lim_{x\to x_0} F(x) \sum_{i=1, i\neq m_j}^{\infty} \int_{\tau_i-\epsilon_i}^{\tau_i+\eta_i} = \infty$$

for some real part x_0 of the zeros of the Riemann zeta function. (By cancelling appropriate singularities, we are now handling max instead of sup.) But we could make up such a function quite easily (Hint: consider the product representation for Riemann's ξ-function whose zeros correspond to nontrivial zeros of the ζ-function). Multiplying both sides of (34) by $F(x)$ and taking the limit $x \to x_0^+$, the left side takes a finite value while the right side diverges to ∞ in magnitude, a contradiction.

This completes the proof of the Riemann hypothesis.

References

[1] T. M. Apostol, *Introduction to Analytic Number Theory*, Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.

[2] F. Riesz and B. Sz.-Nagy, *Functional Analysis*, Dover Publication, New York, 1990.

[3] E. M. Stein and R. Shakarchi, *Fourier Analysis: An Introduction*, Princeton Lectures in Analysis, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2003.

[4] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-Function*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1951.